

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA  
FLORENCE DIVISION

Leonard Needelman,	)	C/A No. 4:11-1273-TLW-TER
	)	
	)	
Petitioner,	)	
	)	
vs.	)	<b>Report and Recommendation</b>
	)	
Mildred Rivera, Warden	)	
	)	
Respondent.	)	
	)	

Petitioner, Needelman (Petitioner), is currently incarcerated at the Federal Correctional Institution (FCI) Estill, South Carolina. Petitioner appearing *pro se*, filed his petition for a writ of habeas corpus pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2241<sup>1</sup> on May 26, 2011. Respondent filed a motion for summary judgment on September 1, 2011, along with a return, supporting memorandum and exhibits. The undersigned issued an order filed September 1, 2011, pursuant to Roseboro v. Garrison, 528 F.2d 309 (4<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1975), advising Petitioner of the motion for summary judgment procedure and the possible consequences if he failed to respond adequately. (Doc. #14). No response has been filed by Petitioner to Respondent's motion for summary judgment.

**RULE 41(B) DISMISSAL**

A complaint may be dismissed pursuant to Rule 41(b) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure for failure to prosecute and/or failure to comply with orders of the court. Ballard v. Carlson, 882 F.2d 93 (4<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1989), cert. denied, 493 U.S. 1084 (1990), and Chandler Leasing Corp. v. Lopez, 669 F.2d 919 (4<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1982). In considering whether to dismiss an action pursuant to Rule 41(b), the court is

---

<sup>1</sup> This habeas corpus case was automatically referred to the undersigned United States magistrate judge pursuant to the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Local Rule 19.02 (B)(2)(c), DSC. Because this is a dispositive motion, this report and recommendation is entered for review by the district judge.

required to consider four factors:

- (1) the degree of plaintiff's responsibility in failing to respond;
- (2) the amount of prejudice to the defendant;
- (3) the history of the plaintiff in proceeding in a dilatory manner; and,
- (4) the existence of less drastic sanctions other than dismissal.

Davis v. Williams, 588 F.2d 69 (4th Cir. 1978).

In the present case, the Petitioner is proceeding pro se so he is entirely responsible for his actions. It is solely through Petitioner's neglect, and not that of an attorney, that no responses have been filed. Petitioner has not responded to Respondent's motion for summary judgment or the court's order requiring him to respond. On September 12, 2011, the court received a letter from Petitioner in which he stated that he had received the motion for summary judgment but "I did not receive any instructions concerning the time and location for my answer." (Doc. #16). Therefore, the Roseboro Order was remailed to Petitioner on September 13, 2011, and the time for response to the motion for summary judgment and Roseboro order was reset for October 17, 2011. Petitioner has not filed a response and has not filed any further documents with this court. No other reasonable sanctions are available. Accordingly, it is recommended that this action be dismissed pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. Proc. 41(b).

### **CONCLUSION**

As set out above, a review of the record indicates that the petition should be dismissed for failure to prosecute. It is, therefore,

RECOMMENDED that the petition be dismissed for failure to prosecute pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. Proc. 41(b) with prejudice.

Respectfully submitted,

November 23, 2011  
Florence, South Carolina

s/Thomas E. Rogers, III  
Thomas E. Rogers, III  
United States Magistrate Judge

**The parties' attention is directed to the important information on the attached notice.**